DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 476 LI 002 095

AUTHOR	Voigt, Melvin J.
TITLE	The Undergraduate Library; The Collection and its Selection.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., San Diego. University Library.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	26p.; Paper prepared for the Institute on Training for Service in Undergraduate Libraries..., August 17-21, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
DESCRIPTORS	Books, College Libraries, *Library Collections, *Library Material Selection, *Library Planning, *Periodicals, *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Undergraduate Libraries

ABSTRACT

There is a direct relationship between the care with which the book collection is developed and the success of the library. Questions which must be answered before developing a selection policy statement include: How large, broad or intensive should the periodical collection be? What should the policy be on back files of periodicals? On periodical indexes? Also basic questions on audio materials must be answered. A policy statement must also take into account the hard facts of what an institution can and will do in supporting the program. In addition, the policy statement should spell out the methods of selection development to be used, including the extent and manner in which faculty and nonlibrary staff will be used. Initial undergraduate collections vary in size from 15,000 to 60,000 volumes, with maximums expected ranging from 62,900 to 200,000. The size of the institution, availability of research collections and other libraries and the nature of educational programs are factors which help govern the size and nature of the undergraduate library collection. (NH)

ED 042476

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Institute on

TRAINING FOR SERVICE IN UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARIES

sponsored by
The University Library
University of California, San Diego*

August 17-21, 1970

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY; THE COLLECTION AND ITS SELECTION

by

Melvin J. Voigt
University Librarian
University of California, San Diego

LI 002095

*Conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Title II-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, P. L. 89-329, as amended.

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY:
THE COLLECTION AND ITS SELECTION

I. The Importance of the Collection

Undergraduate libraries do not differ from other libraries in their most important attribute: they could and would not exist without books. Books are the essential ingredient, and thus the critical question in justifying the undergraduate library is whether there is a definable and viable book collection which will be of more value to undergraduate students in meeting the educational objectives of undergraduate education than does the large research library. The existence of an increasing number of undergraduate libraries indicates that librarians have answered this question affirmatively. Some of the other questions which may be asked become less relevant if this question has a positive response. For example, Do the needs of graduate and undergraduate students differ to such a degree that separate libraries for each are justified? or, Are book collections readily divisible into graduate and undergraduate components? As is noted in other papers, there are many other questions which may swing the balance in making a decision to have or not to have an undergraduate library, but factors, such as campus geography, number of students, undergraduate curriculum, and the desirability of special reference services for undergraduates, would probably not carry enough weight unless it is clear that it is possible to create a book collection which will improve the undergraduate's access to the books which are useful to him and which will provide for a large percentage of his library needs.

There has been less concern about dividing graduates and undergraduates, as planners have recognized that a substantial proportion of the use of a good

undergraduate library will be from graduate students (unless use is restricted). The possibility of making a sharp division of materials to create an undergraduate component of the collection is not very important for the user if the undergraduate has easy access to the research collection when the smaller library fails to meet his needs.

It is clear that the book collection--its size, selection, and maintenance--is of major importance and that there will be a direct relationship between the care with which it is developed and the success of the library.

The size of the collection raises questions which relate directly to basic considerations in the establishment of an undergraduate library. These questions will be considered in various parts of this presentation. If cost and space factors will not permit a collection large or broad enough to meet the requirements of a given institution, it is likely that a solution other than a separate undergraduate library should be sought.

II. The Selection Policy

A. Questions Which Must be Answered Before a Policy is Formulated.

The question which should be considered first in this section is probably that of the necessity for a selection policy or, specifically, for a selection policy statement. This topic, as it relates to libraries generally, was given extensive consideration in last year's UCSD "Institute on Acquisitions Procedures in Academic Libraries." The unanimous conclusion reached by the participants, that formulation and use of a policy statement is essential to an effective acquisitions program, particularly as it relates to specialized projects and programs, indicates the importance of a clear understanding of the objectives of any acquisitions program.

Rolland C. Stewart, in his paper on "The Undergraduate Library Collection,"[1] prepared for the 1969 Institute, emphasized the importance of defining the clientele to be served. Is it "the total undergraduate population irrespective of collegiate affiliation within the university? Undergraduates enrolled in Nursing, Music, Public Administration, Architecture, Engineering? Or undergraduates enrolled in what might be called the 'general education' college?" He goes on to suggest that "the only practical definition to be concerned with relates to courses and not at all to students."[2] But the question of whether the undergraduate library's service should extend to professional schools must be answered, and it is likely that the answer will not be a simple, unqualified "no." Stewart goes on to raise related questions. "Shall the collection satisfy all courses to which only undergraduates are admitted, or shall it include all courses for which undergraduates may enroll?"[3] The fact that in most institutions course offerings at advanced undergraduate levels are open also to graduate students has probably helped lead to the general acceptance of unrestricted use of the undergraduate library. The extent that graduate students actually use the undergraduate library is a question which cannot be neglected in formulating the collection policy.

The opposite question, the library requirements of the undergraduate beyond the undergraduate library, has a seemingly easy answer in acknowledging and encouraging the use of the research library by undergraduates as a supplement to their own facility. In determining collection policy, the question is not that simple. The "research" concept has become important in undergraduate education and, indeed, far below the college level. Without entering the discussion on the use or misuse of the term, consideration must be given to the fact that the teaching method called "research" increases the requirements for library materials at all levels. Thus it becomes necessary to make a decision on how far the undergraduate library is expected

to go in meeting these requirements and at what point the general research library will have to take over. While size of collection will obviously be an important factor in relating the policy to research requirements, it is not the only one; for the makeup of the collection will reflect the degree to which its materials support undergraduate research, and not only by the number of books.

Before a collection statement can be written, there must be consideration of other topics, such as the comparative emphasis on reserved books, on broader curricular requirements, and on noncurricular values, usually expressed in an idealistic phrase, such as "stimulating lifetime reading habits." If professional school requirements are ruled out, the question remains as to how much the collection should do in representing those subjects for the nonprofessional.

Some other questions which must be answered have been considered in other papers and will have been discussed by the group earlier in the week. These include additional aspects on the relation of the collection to the curriculum, the reference collection, and questions of making the collection better meet the needs of culturally and educationally disadvantaged students. A collection policy should be as specific as possible without inhibiting the need for flexibility. It might, for example, state that one-volume "readers" should be included when available, without closing out options for use of judgement in the degree to which these will be supplemented by specific works.

Other questions, which will only be mentioned here but which require answers prior to development of a policy statement, include the following: How large, broad, or intensive should the periodical collection be? What should the policy be on back files of periodicals? On periodical indexes? Basic questions on audio

materials--speech, music, taped lectures, and other learning resource materials--must be answered with a good deal more detail than a simple "yes" or "no."

A selection policy, to be useful, must be much more than a definition. To say that an undergraduate library provides a collection of carefully selected books containing the titles all undergraduates should be exposed to, may do, as a broad definition to use in obtaining support, but it has very little value to book selectors as a policy statement.

B. Dollars and Numbers and the Policy Statement.

The first part of this section dealt with fundamental questions related to collection development. A policy statement will not be very useful unless it also takes into account the hard facts of what an institution can and will do in supporting the program. Stewart stated the problem very well in his paper last year. "Assuming that we have groped our way through the mystique of defining purposes and have got hold of an ideological tool with which we can create an undergraduate collection, we face the question of money, prospects for more money, and still more money. Paradoxically speaking, the budget is the sire of all selection criteria we might devise. Objectives and the means to achieve them must be commensurate."[4] Determining these numbers and using the dollars effectively will be considered in succeeding sections, but unless the collection policy is based on realistic estimates of dollars available for the original collection and for its maintenance, its value will be greatly diminished.

Dollars can also be expressed quantitatively in what they will provide, and it is to be hoped that the funding agreed upon as realistic for the institution will be based on the number of titles considered essential to meet a carefully

developed set of objectives. In any case, the collection policy must be realistic in its expectations of the number of titles in the basic collection, the planned rate of growth, the amount of duplication and multiple copies for reserve, the extent of periodical holdings, the size of reference collection, inclusion of audio materials, etc.

C. Developing and Using a Policy.

Previous paragraphs have included most of the ingredients for a policy statement. In addition to covering the purposes and extent and range necessary to implement the purposes, it should spell out the methods of selection development which will be used, including the extent and manner in which faculty and personnel other than the undergraduate library staff will be used. The statement itself should be a document resulting from input from all faculty and staff members who have an interest in the collection's development and maintenance. In the beginning the impetus within the library may come from the director of the library or his assistant. But as soon as possible, the direct responsibility should be assigned to the person who will be responsible for the library. No matter how important the day-to-day activities of planning and operating the library, it would seem highly desirable that the collection should continue to be a major responsibility of the head of the undergraduate library. The whole process of selection for an undergraduate library is an important educational opportunity for the librarian and increases his competency as an interpreter of its collection. One of the most important reasons for a clearly stated collection policy statement is that it will make it possible for the head of the library to carry out the broad responsibilities of management without giving undue time to some of the day-to-day selection decisions which become obvious on the

basis of established policy. This statement and the emphasis on a policy statement should not imply that the selector's job is done when the policy statement is written. The last paragraph of the University of Maryland "Selection Philosophy" statement clearly indicates the continuing importance of the selecting process.

> "These guide lines are intended only for general assistance. Each principle should be given consideration and weighed against the others. For example, the aspect of currency in a specific title may be in conflict with completeness or readability. The good judgment of the person recommending the material should put each aspect into proper perspective."[5]

A collection policy statement should be a live document. It should reflect changes in educational programs as they occur and should take into account experience-in-use patterns as they are developed in the library. One might argue that the collection policy should be so simple and so flexible that it should not be formulated and adopted in written form. One suspects however that, when used, this argument is more likely to be a rationalization or an excuse.

The values of a policy statement are many. Selection should, of course, be guided by it. This is especially important when faculty are involved. Faculty opinions on what should be in any library vary greatly, and this is particularly true in an undergraduate library. Experience in the University of California's New Campuses Program, and in refining that selection for Books for College Libraries,[6] showed that if faculty members (not all, but many) were allowed to do the choosing without further editing, the imbalance, the areas skipped, and the number of doubtful titles chosen would cause very difficult problems. Faculty members

should assist in selection, especially of the basic collection. If they can be involved in the development of the policy statement or, if not, if they work under the guidelines of such a statement, the results will be not only a better collection but also a much smoother road in reaching that objective.

In the next section, questions of variations in collections are considered. Obviously, if the library becomes a "package" identical to other undergraduate libraries, as some suggest may soon happen, a collection policy statement becomes superfluous except to the degree that additions are made to the package. With partial preselection plans and approval systems, a policy statement becomes, if anything, more important. The profile which governs the books coming to the library is, in fact, a part of the policy statement, and the librarian's job of keeping the collection development in line with agreed-on objectives becomes much easier than it would be without the policy's guidance.

III. Variations in Collections

Until recently, book selection courses in library schools put great emphasis on the librarian's responsibility for the selection of every title to meet the library's requirements and argued strongly against blanket orders, approval plans which allowed for little selection, and package libraries. Now that most of these have become widely practiced, although not wholly accepted, it is necessary to look carefully to determine whether there should be any variation in libraries which have the same broad purposes, such as undergraduate libraries. Certainly there are arguments on both sides, and while the possibility of lower costs in selection and processing is probably the strongest one in favor of uniformity, it is not the only one. The possibilities for greater depth of analysis and for a subject approach geared to

undergraduates' needs, to his manner of seeking information, and to the, as yet, poorly understood information processing abilities of the human brain at the college level stage of development, could be greatly improved if this could be done in computer-produced packages. A product with values far beyond the ability of an individual library to produce could be provided. Even with such possibilities, it would seem clear that the collections should be supplemented by additional material fitted to the needs of a specific institution. Orne,[7] in speaking of the collection, makes it sound very easy, requiring less effort than most librarians feel should go into selection. His comment, "The assurance of success with our second factor (the book collection) is now simply a measure of intelligent application, but it is assured," will probably not be argued with if the word "intelligent" is underlined. If the microform libraries being developed today have general acceptance it will be interesting to see whether, by making large increases in the amount of material available, the need for individuality will decrease. It may be that to reach this objective, the collection will have to become so large that, as with the research library today, the library becomes unmanageable for the undergraduate. With greater problems of access, contrasted with the ease with which material can be accepted or rejected when examined on the shelf, the point of exasperated futility may be reached sooner.

Regardless of what may happen, it is clear that there is a good deal of variation in collections today. If one examines the sections on the book collection in each of the chapters dealing with specific undergraduate libraries in Irene Braden's The Undergraduate Library,[8] it is clear that while general goals and the selection tools and methods used to reach those goals were similar, there

was considerable variation in the resulting collections. Part of this was caused by the availability of duplicates or existing reserve collections. In Cornell's case, a book store was purchased and availability influenced both direction and size of the original collection. Warren Kuhn's report[9] shows that, in size, initial collections varied from 15,000 to 60,000 volumes, present collections from 45,000 to 145,000, and maximums expected ranged from 62,900 to 200,000. It seems doubtful at this time whether there should be any attempt to fix an ideal or standard size for the collection. Orne's recent article[10] is quite specific in what he considers to be the optimum size and comprehensiveness. The size of the institution, availability of research collections and other libraries, the nature of educational programs and methods are among the factors which would appear to govern both the size and nature of the collection.

Circulation studies have indicated that use is concentrated in a smaller proportion of a collection than was generally expected when the first undergraduate libraries were established. Thus an undergraduate library may find it possible to include fewer titles than might have been thought necessary. But this is true only if the selection can produce the titles which make up the actual usage. It was the evidence of usage, together with the experience of the New Campuses Program, which made it possible for UCSD to plan for three undergraduate libraries of 50,000 to 60,000 volumes instead of one library three times as large. It is true that less duplicates are involved than in one library serving the same total number of students. But even when one allows for this, the total number of titles is much less than in undergraduate libraries of 150,000 to 200,000 volumes. In the New Campuses Program, where titles were chosen one by one to meet specific

requirements of the collection, it was surprising to everyone involved how much depth was provided before the number of titles was reached which had been calculated as "quotas" for most subject fields.

Changes in courses offered to undergraduate students and in teaching methods result in new requirements for libraries. It is difficult to determine how much these changes, particularly the changes in teaching methods affect, or should affect, the collection itself. It can be argued that a good undergraduate collection will be able to meet the students' needs in spite of such changes, as long as the collection is kept up to date and reflects new subject matter which is brought into the curriculum. Many of the early undergraduate collections were made up largely of reserve books. Gradually these were augmented by titles which it was felt the undergraduate should have access to and which were rarely available to him in a closed stack, general circulating library. As teaching methods moved slowly away from dependence on specific readings and reserve books toward allowing students to use materials from a larger collection without prescription, the undergraduate library became a natural solution. Today, with a trend toward allowing the student even more freedom in reaching his educational objectives, it is necessary to question whether the collection again needs to change to reflect this broadened tendency toward allowing the student to find his own way. It is probably true that today's undergraduates need fewer general works in a subject area and more depth than was thought necessary a few years ago.

As is pointed out in other papers, the undergraduate student in an institution with a good undergraduate library tends to use the graduate library more than he did previously. If this greater utilization can be attributed to the undergraduate library

in terms of its calling the students attention to materials which he would not otherwise be aware of or in simply making him more aware of the existence and usefulness of libraries generally, it may well be that more attention should be given to consciously developing the collection to further this result and that a means should be found to make the collection itself help bridge the gap between the two libraries. On the other hand, an objective of the library is to provide as much as possible for the undergraduate students' needs. To do this, a principle of selecting good reference works and basic general books in subject areas and then including more specific books indexed or recommended in these more general works, will lead the user into the collection rather than out of it. Probably a good deal of research is needed before we can determine how much should or can be done in changing the basic nature of undergraduate collections to meet these variant objectives.

IV. How Various Collections Were Chosen Initially

A. The Collection

When selection for the undergraduate library at Harvard began in 1947, there was no previous guide to such a collection which could be used. Since then, the Lamont Catalogue,[11] the selections for the Michigan Undergraduate Library which became available by purchasing cards or through microfilm, Books for College Libraries,[12] and Choice,[13] for more recent titles, as well as other lists have become available to assist the selector in developing the undergraduate collection. (See also Carpenter's discussion on the use of the Lamont Catalogue.)[14] Since the methods which were used to put together the initial collections at Harvard, Michigan, South Carolina, Indiana, Cornell, and Texas are described in detail in

Irene Braden's The Undergraduate Library, [15] this paper will not attempt to duplicate that information. In reviewing the development of the original collection for the six institutions surveyed by Braden, one notes that in every case the development of the collection was the responsibility of one individual, whether or not he was expected to become the librarian of the new unit. In each instance there were collections already available which were utilized for the undergraduate collection. At Harvard, there were reserve books and gifts from duplicate collections. At Michigan, study hall libraries and gifts were utilized. At South Carolina, the reserve book collection and two other special duplicating collections were utilized. At Indiana, undergraduate reserve books and the books in several specialized reading rooms were included. At Cornell, there was a departmental library in the Arts and Sciences, and at Texas, materials were taken from what is called the "Resource Collection." After the Michigan list became available it seems to have been used to a greater degree than the Lamont Catalogue. There does seem to have been considerable variation in the amount of dependence on such sources as publishers catalogs, reviews in scholarly journals, subject bibliographies in monographs, and listings in Publishers' Weekly and other current bibliographical tools. The experience with faculty selection also seems to vary considerably. The experience in these institutions bears out that of others which have not been included in the Braden survey, that faculty can be used up to a point, particularly if they are given something to work with, that is, a copy of the Michigan list or something in card form which they can go through quickly, indicating titles which they feel to be important. As was noted earlier, when faculty are used to develop initial lists, as was attempted at Michigan, the result is usually not very satisfactory.

While librarians on the staff of the university library were used to a considerable degree by some of the libraries, it is surprising that more of the selection was not detailed to the subject specialists who must have been available in most of these libraries.

While a number of the universities which pioneered undergraduate libraries attempted to develop basic collections of considerable size by the time the library opened, most of the institutions which have started the development of undergraduate libraries in recent years have begun with very small collections and an accelerated growth pattern over a period of years, with the intent of leveling off when, what are considered ideal collections for their purposes, are attained. This procedure has a disadvantage, particularly if a building is available to house a substantial collection, in that students during the early years are limited to whatever part of the collection may have been obtained up to that time. Thus, while budget considerations may have been the limiting factor in slowing the development of undergraduate libraries, it may be that collections developed in this manner will prove to reflect the needs of the students and educational programs better than those selected en masse before opening day. It is interesting to note that in most of the literature which has been published on the development of undergraduate libraries, little attention has been paid to the possibility of students themselves assisting in the selection of a collection for their own use. While it is true that in most cases they will not be able to suggest individual titles which should be purchased, they can be of great value to the undergraduate librarian who is in close touch with student users. This may come primarily through their requests for information, which reference librarians are in the best position to note, but also it may come

directly through conscious efforts to encourage them to report on subject areas and types of materials which they need and which are not available to them in the undergraduate library.

At UCSD, because of the initial location of the library and because undergraduate library needs were concentrated in certain areas at the beginning, the collection development began with concentration in certain subject fields and then gradually moved on to other fields as basic collections were completed in the original fields of concentration. If there is a general library close at hand for the undergraduate students to use this may be the best approach, in that the students will have a substantial collection of materials in specific subject areas available within a short period of time, while they can clearly see that in other areas it is essential for them to use a different library. As Robert H. Muller points out, [16] with the aid of both comprehensive and selective tools, it is now possible to compile an initial list of "candidates" to be considered for selection without having to rely largely on nonselective publishers catalogs, bibliographies, booksellers lists, etc.

A major problem in developing any undergraduate library or, for that matter, a basic collection for any new institution is a question of out-of-print books. Fortunately, from the point of view of availability but perhaps unfortunately from the point of view of price, many of the out-of-print books included in what have become standard lists have been reprinted.

The subject distribution in undergraduate libraries has been remarkably similar. One might conclude from this that the question of what makes up a good undergraduate library has been fairly well determined and that we may be well

on the way to package libraries. One can also speculate however that, when it was decided in the published Lamont Catalogue that books on literature and language made up 37.5 percent of the total; history, 18.2 percent; books in the social sciences, 17.3 percent; and so on, other libraries accepted these as norms and they became standards to be followed. When the books were selected for the New Campuses Program at the University of California, the Lamont breakdown, not only for large subject areas but for smaller ones as well, was used along with some other sources in estimating how many titles would probably be selected in each of the subject fields identified. While the selectors may, to some degree, have attempted "to fill their quota" and go no further, it was evident early in the selection activity that, given the objectives of basic collections upon which research collections could be built, some subject areas would go well beyond the numbers listed for Lamont and others would fall far short. However, when the totals were added up for broad subject fields, the percentages came fairly close to those for the Lamont Library and those at Michigan as well, as is shown in the table in the preface to Books for College Libraries.[17]

Muller[18] lists some of the other problems encountered when carrying out selection, such as determining which are the indispensible classics, where one stops in selecting from the mass of books about an author, how to deal with quantity on a subject when a few items, or perhaps one, stand out far above the others, the question of including works in original languages, and how far one goes in selecting variant translations. While these and many other questions will perplex the selectors of the original collection and those working on maintaining the collection, it is fortunate indeed that every undergraduate library expects to continue adding

materials and that, as far as this writer knows, none of them have restricted themselves totally to adding new books. Thus, most persons who are selecting the basic collection for undergraduate libraries today tend to be conservative when questions, such as those noted above, arise with the knowledge, or at least hope, that if experience indicates that a broader selection is necessary, this will be discovered in the use made of the library.

V. Maintenance of Collections

A. Decisions on Rate of Growth and Distribution.

Since most undergraduate libraries today are opening with partial collections, with the basic collection to be developed over a period of time, there is a possibility of less guess work in the original selection, as noted earlier. For the purposes of this section, it will be assumed that a basic collection has been established and that we are concerned with the various aspects of maintenance. While most of the growth of the collection will be in terms of newly published books, the need to add older volumes to meet new requirements and changing emphasis within subjects will continue.

There are many factors which go into the question of determining the continuing rate of growth or additions to a collection. Many libraries have followed the lead of the Lamont Library with a policy aiming at having the size of the library remain approximately the same, with the same number of volumes added and discarded each year. It is unlikely that any library will follow such a principle completely. However, where it is an objective, due either to policy or to space limitations, the tendency will be to add fewer volumes than when it is possible to continue adding volumes for a long period of time without restrictions. After the

Harvard collection reached a total of 100,000 volumes in 1951, it has had a net growth per year of approximately 3,000 volumes since then and gross growth of just under 6,000 volumes. [19] At Michigan, the undergraduate library had reached 68,000 volumes by 1959 and has had an average net growth of 8,000 volumes per year since then, with the rate of growth dropping only slightly in recent years. [20] The other libraries studied by Irene Braden began with smaller collections and have not been in operation long enough to provide good statistics to determine what their leveling off growth rate might be. Stabilized collections of 150,000 or 200,000 volumes will add more and discard more than ones which have leveled out in the 50,000 to 75,000 volume range. However, it is doubtful that a percentage figure could be substantiated or agreed upon. This question is one that should be related to purposes of the collection and should reflect experience with use. An institution which puts great emphasis on the social sciences or on modern literature will probably need to add more volumes than one which has a greater percentage of use coming from students in history and most fields of literature. Since this is an important question, but with little standardization to date, it is suggested that some time be given to discussion by the group, based on the experience and the plans of the institutions represented.

The last section discussed the question of subject distribution of the original collection. It is rather obvious that the distribution of books added will not be the same as for the original collection. It would be expected that the percentage of books added in the sciences and social sciences would be greater than those percentages in the original collection.

B. The Budget

Once a growth rate has been determined, the calculation of the budget required for an undergraduate library is probably a good deal easier than for most other parts of the university library. Most of the books will be current, and a large percentage will be published in this country. Thus, statistics of prices, which are generally available, will be applicable. Calculating increases for inflation, year by year, is a good deal simpler than attempting to do this for research collections with large numbers of serials coming from foreign countries and with many out-of-print books with widely fluctuating prices. An undergraduate library will undoubtedly continue to have desiderata lists of books wanted originally which have not been found, as well as books found to be desirable later. Some funding should be reserved to obtain these as they appear, whether from the secondhand market or in the form of reprints.

It is likely that in every undergraduate library there will be pressures for an increasing number of periodicals. Here, the establishment of a policy is particularly important. Unless it is determined whether periodicals will be provided only for current informational purposes, or whether back files of moderate length will be available for a limited Abridged Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature type of use, or whether the intent is to provide enough in the way of periodicals to allow students to do many term papers and projects without using the central library, the librarian will be in trouble in making and justifying decisions on individual titles and length of back files. With periodicals and reference works, campus size and the distance of the undergraduate library from the research library becomes very important in establishing policy. Once a policy has been

determined, it will be a good deal easier to decide whether or not to add a title to the collection and whether back files are required. The policy may need to be made subject by subject as needs will vary, and obviously there will be exceptions. But the librarian and the faculty must be clear on the policy if there is to be any consistency in the collection.

C. Responsibility for Maintenance

As was indicated earlier, the responsibility for adding to the collection should be assigned to the head of the unit. But he will need all the help he can get. If he depends entirely on his knowledge of books, on his intuition, or even on his personal observations of use, and on conversations with faculty and students, the results will, at best, be spotty. Using reference librarians as part-time bibliographers or selection librarians has become common in many types of libraries. In the undergraduate library the staff working directly with students and faculty should be in a better position to see what is needed and what will be used than any others in or out of the library. But familarity with subjects, authors, and publishing trends is also important. Thus, the selection responsibility should be delegated and spread as widely as possible among those whose knowledge can be useful and who are willing to be guided and restrained by a collection development policy and the realities of budgetary allocations.

Students can be directly useful in addition to their indirect contribution through library use and requests for information. A number of libraries have utilized student committees successfully for general guidance. Others have found that student enthusiasm and knowledge can be especially useful in developing or expanding collections in areas of current concern: minorities, special cultures, political questions, conservation, etc.

D. Methods of Selection

The more inclusive a library, the easier the job of selection. The undergraduate library, by its special character, complicates the job of selection. The importance or intrinsic value of a candidate for inclusion in the collection may carry less weight than the manner of presentation, the level, and the relevance to specific programs. If an undergraduate library is adding 5,000 volumes per year, the selection of the first 2,500 will be relatively easy. The work of a major writer or an obviously important book in an area of current concern will cause no problems. These books will find their way into the library regardless of the method of selection: from a listing in a trade bibliography, in a review journal, or by inclusion in an approval plan. A surprisingly large part of current acquisitions will be obvious additions. For the remainder, however, the methods of selection are likely to be as varied as the results. Libraries will also vary in their sense of urgency in making new books available as soon as possible after publication. This policy may be the deciding factor in using an approval plan or in making selections on the basis of reviews.

Faculty participation in current selection will be looked on with favor by most librarians, with an immediate qualification that it can rarely be depended on in terms of regularity or consistency. Obviously, books which are wanted for reserve or are included in lists of suggested reading must be obtained (although rarely in the quantities recommended). The success of an undergraduate library has a direct relationship to faculty interest and to the librarian' s ability to involve the faculty. Since faculty interest is most likely to be in the collection, it would be foolish not to encourage faculty participation in selection. Yet, experience in

libraries generally has been that when the faculty finds that the library staff is able to do a good job in selection, the faculty is happy to turn over the entire process to the library. Thus, there are contradictions which are not easily answered. The experience and views of the participants in the Institute should provide for an interesting discussion of this topic.

Approval plans, as applied to undergraduate libraries, will usually operate either independently of a broader campus plan or as a part of such a plan. If the undergraduate library has the competence one would hope for, the latter system would appear to be superior. To be able to review the totality of American publishing in the fields of interest, with the books in hand, should enable competent librarians to make good selections of a majority of titles added and should result in having the books in use much sooner than by other methods. If the books available for consideration are limited to those a dealer has selected as applicable to the undergraduate library, the librarians will find it difficult to do much more than accept most of the titles, rejecting only the ones which are obviously not suited to his library because of subject emphasis. The doubtful titles from a larger selection can be noted for further consideration when ratings or reviews become available. Making selections from a larger group will also make possible a fast response to new areas of intensive interest on the part of library users.

E. Selection Tools

If approval plans are not used or if, as is likely, they are supplemented by selections from other sources, the question of selection tools becomes important. For maintenance of collections, published lists which include only books to a certain date and which do not have supplements are obviously of little

value. The question, then, is whether current selection tools for the undergraduate library are any different than those for a general library or, more specifically, for a college library. The most obvious source, Choice, is intended for the college library, and it would seem reasonable that if it is useful for the college library it is also useful in making selections for the undergraduate library. There may be discussion of its intrinsic value and on how it might best be used in maintaining the undergraduate library. One might suggest that a specialized guide, such as Books Abroad, might be of more value to a college library, but others would probably point out that in some institutions the undergraduate library might include more items from Books Abroad than would a college library in an institution with limited programs.

There would seem to be little point in listing standard selection tools in this paper. There is little information available on their use by those responsible for the continuing development of undergraduate libraries. A discussion of practical aspects of this topic by participants should be useful.

References

1. Stewart, Rolland C. The Undergraduate Library Collection. (Institute on Acquisitions Procedures in Academic Libraries, University of California, San Diego, 1969) 4 p.

2. ibid, p. 1

3. ibid, p. 1-2

4. ibid, p. 2

5. Maryland. University. A Selection Philosophy for the Undergraduate Library Collection. 1968. 3 p.

6. Voigt, Melvin J. and Treyz, Joseph H. Books for College Libraries. 1967. 1056 p.

7. Orne, Jerrold. The Undergraduate Library. Library Journal 95, 2230-2233 (1970)

8. Braden, Irene A. The Undergraduate Library. 1970. 158 p.

9. Kuhn, Warren B. Summary of the Responses to the Warren Kuhn Questionnaire. UGLI Newsletter No. 2, p. 5-7 (Nov. 1969)

10. op. cit.

11. Harvard University. Library. Lamont Library. Catalogue of the Lamont Library. 1953. 562 p.

12. Voigt, Melvin J. and Treyz, Joseph H., op. cit.

13. Choice; Books for College Libraries. 1961-

14. Carpenter, Charles A. The Lamont Catalogue as a Guide to Book Selection. College and Research Libraries. 18, 267-268 (1957)

15. op. cit.

16. Muller, Robert H. The Undergraduate Library Trend at Large Universities. In Advances in Librarianship. v.1, 1970. p. 113-132.

17. op. cit., p. v.

18. op. cit.

19. Braden, Irene A., op. cit., p. 17

20. Stewart, Rolland C., op. cit., Appendix B.